

Serial No. 10/073,399

- 2 -

52311sh

undersigned cannot find such a disclosure; perhaps the Examiner can point out how the '060 patent anticipates this limitation.

Regarding claim 19, apart from the fact that this is not a bushing and the "sleeves" are conical, claim 19 sets forth "a shoe disposed between the outer sleeve and at least some of the elements." Using the Examiner's interpretation, the "shoe" 6 of Neidhart is disposed against the inner sleeve, and has no portion between the outer sleeve and at least some of the elements. The reference simply does not anticipate. Claim 22 adds to claim 15 the limitation of elements that are of a shape that demonstrate a low stress concentration under compression, and claim 23 adds to claim 22 the elements being cylindrical having a round or elliptical cross section. Since the Examiner makes no comment regarding the rejection of claim 22 over Neidhart, Applicant respectfully requests that reasons either be given or the claims be allowed.

Claims 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Neidhart on the ground that (according to the Examiner) one of skill in the art would consider the limitations of these claims to be "a matter of choice." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 24 includes the limitation of the elements being toroidal; claim 25 includes the limitation of the elements being spheres; and claim 26 includes the limitation of the elements being ellipsoids. These are positively recited structural limitations requiring examination. They cannot simply be disregarded because no prior art has been identified.

Claims 15, 16, 19, 20 and 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rosenzweig. Among the myriad other differences between this reference and Applicant's invention as claimed, there appears to Applicant to be no teaching or suggestion of elements being preloaded through compression to control the relative movement between the sleeves. Indeed, it seems to Applicant that the casing portions 27 and 19 move in unison once the support of Rosenzweig is assembled.

The Examiner concedes that Rosenzweig lacks the recitation of the sleeves having cylindrical shapes, but claims that it would have been a matter of choice because there is no persuasive evidence that the particular configuration "was significant." While, considering that Applicant's invention relates to a bushing as opposed to an anti-vibration support, it appears that cylindrical shapes are both important and in need of examination. Regarding claims 19 and 20, the Examiner claims that the "actuator 37" of Rosenzweig is used "for adjusting the level of preload compression." However, according to Rosenzweig, adjustable plates are provided solely for the purpose of eliminating

Serial No. 10/073,399

- 3 -

52311sh

"looseness" (line 90). Taking up excess space to prevent looseness is not the same as preload compression.

Based upon the foregoing comments, Applicant believes the present application is in condition for allowance. Questions regarding this application may be directed to the undersigned attorney by telephone facsimile or electronic mail.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John G. Posn

Reg. No. 37,424

Clifford, Krass, Groh, Sprinkle,

Anderson & Citkowski, PC

PO Box 7021

Troy, MI 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300 FAX (734) 913-6007

Dated: November 23, 2005

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000